

Panaji, 10th July, 2014 (Asadha 19, 1936)

SERIES II No. 15

OFFICIAL GAZETTE



GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note:- There are two Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 14 dated 03-07-2014 as follows:—

- (1) *Extraordinary dated 03-07-2014 from pages 241 to 244 regarding Notifications from Department of Elections (GSEC).*
- (2) *Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 08-07-2014 from pages 245 to 246 regarding Notification from Department of General Administration.*

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Education, Art & Culture

Directorate of Education

Order

No. 1(1)-3-2013/SE/647

Read: 1) Order No. 1(1)-3-2003/SE/360 dated 1-7-2013.

2) Order No. 1(1)-3-2003/SE/430 dated 5-9-2013.

Government is pleased to extend further period of ad hoc promotion in respect of the following Dy. Education Officer/Principal, Government Higher Secondary School/Jt. Secretary, GBSHSE/ Vocational Education Officer/Dy. Director, SIE in the Directorate of Education ordered vide orders under reference 1 & 2 above, for a further period of 6 (six) months with effect from 02-07-2014 to 01-01-2015 and 06-09-2014 to 05-03-2015 in the pay scale of ₹ 15,600-39,100+Grade Pay of ₹ 7,600/- with concurrence of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/11/15(2)/2014/408 dated 05-06-2014 or till the posts are filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier as per the names shown in column No. 2.

Sr. No.	Name of the Officers	Order No. and date of ad hoc promotion	Period of further extension of ad hoc promotion
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri P. M. Yedave	No. 1(1)-3-2013/SE/360 dated 1-7-2013	02-07-2014 to 01-01-2015.
2.	Shri M. V. Gadgil	—do—	—do—
3.	Smt. Sunita N. Rajderkar/ /Nasnodkar	—do—	—do—
4.	Shri Fondu Savlo Naik @ Narayan S. Naik, Principal	—do—	—do—
5.	Shri Jose Francisco Gomes	—do—	—do—
6.	Shri Sadashiv B. Naik	No.1(1)-3-2013/SE/430 dated 5-9-2013	06-09-2014 to 05-03-2015.
7.	Smt. Vishakha D. Pusekar	No.1(1)-3-2013/SE/430 dated 5-9-2013	06-09-2014 to 05-03-2015.
8.	Shri Roque P. Cabral	—do—	—do—
9.	Smt. Pushpa S. Pawaskar @ Rashmi S. Bandodkar	—do—	—do—

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Anil V. Powar, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Education).

Porvorim, 19th June, 2014.

Department of General Administration

—
Order

No. 14/8/2001-GAD-III (Part II)/1533

Government is pleased to extend the ad hoc promotion of Shri Tulsidas S. Karanzalkar, Section Officer, Central Registry, General Administration Department, Secretariat, Porvorim-Goa for a period of one year with effect from 15-05-2014 to 14-05-2015, or till the post is filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

This issues with the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/11/42(4)/2012/481 dated 18-06-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Varsha S. Naik, Under Secretary (GA).
Porvorim, 26th June, 2014.

◆◆◆
Department of Home

Home—General Division

—
Notification

No. 1/6/2014-HD(G)/2000

Read: Government Notification No. 1-53-88/HD(G) dated 24-09-1997, published in the Official Gazette Series II No. 32 dated 06-11-1997.

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (s) of Section 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974), read with Section 21 of the General Clauses Act, 1897 (Central Act 10 of 1897), the Government of Goa hereby amends the Government Notification No. 1-53-88/HD(G) dated 24-09-1997, published in the Official Gazette Series II No. 32 dated 06-11-1997 (hereinafter referred to as the 'said Notification'), as follows, namely:-

In the said Notification, in Schedule II, the entries against Serial Nos. (3) and (5) shall be omitted.

This Notification shall come into force with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Neetal P. Amonkar, Under Secretary (Home).
Porvorim, 16th June, 2014.

Department of Labour

—
Order

28/15/2014-Lab/326

Whereas the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. The Goa State Co-operative Bank Limited, Panaji, Goa and its workman, Shri Chandrakant J. Parab, sub-staff, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said dispute");

And whereas the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under Section 7-A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- "(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s. The Goa State Co-operative Bank Limited, Panaji-Goa in dismissing Shri Chandrakant J. Parab, sub-staff, with effect from 10-10-2013, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 05th June, 2014.

—
Order

28/18/2014-Lab/347

Whereas the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Cosme Farma Laboratories Limited, Patto Plaza, Panaji, Goa and its workmen represented by the Federation of Medical and Sales Representatives Association of India, in respect of

the matter specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said dispute");

And whereas the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under Section 7-A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s. Cosme Farma Laboratories Limited, Patto Plaza, Panaji, Goa in discharging the services of the following 80 Sales Promotion Employees with effect from 01-03-2013, as alleged by the Federation of Medical and Sales Representative's Association, is legal and justified?

- 1) Suresh Chandra Verma
- 2) Vaibhaw Srivastava
- 3) Aradhana Dwivedi
- 4) Ashutosh Verma
- 5) Vivek Srivastava
- 6) Rohit Kumar
- 7) Shiv Pratap Verma
- 8) Romesh Verma
- 9) Piyush Trivedi
- 10) Rajesh Kumar
- 11) Sharvan Kumar
- 12) Raj Kumar Vijay
- 13) G. Ram Mohan Rao
- 14) B. Chandrashekar
- 15) N. Santosh
- 16) P. Satish
- 17) V. Venkatesh
- 18) M. Adi Shesha Reddy
- 19) Subrahmanyam
- 20) Maula Ali
- 21) Vala Subramanian
- 22) P. V. Sudhakar
- 23) S. Phani Kishore
- 24) D. S. S. Patnayak
- 25) Amruth Rao
- 26) Md. Abdul Qayyum
- 27) Naveen
- 28) N. Chandramouli
- 29) Y. Rajesh Kumar

- 30) P. Suresh
- 31) Ramakrishna
- 32) A. N. Banerjee
- 33) Santanu Choudhury
- 34) Soumya Kanti Roy
- 35) Tanmoy Das
- 36) Gaitam Gupta
- 37) Smarajit Saha
- 38) Sabyasachi Goswami
- 39) K. G. Saha
- 40) Amit Dey
- 41) S. S. S. Roy
- 42) Anjan Chatterjee
- 43) P. K. Bandyopadhyay
- 44) Subrata Bhattacharjee
- 45) Uday Kumar
- 46) Sanjev Kumar
- 47) Upkar Kumar
- 48) Nilamani Dixit
- 49) P. K. Samal
- 50) B. K. Sahoo
- 51) J. R. Sarangi
- 52) P. K. Baral
- 53) S. K. Majhi
- 54) Amaraendra Kr. Biswal
- 55) Pradeep Kr. Behera
- 56) Rameshwar Debata
- 57) Anirban Dey
- 58) Picklu Ghosh
- 59) Badigar Kalappa
- 60) Mantesh Patel
- 61) Rakesh Galav
- 62) Deepak Lashkar
- 63) Kirti Jain
- 64) Ashwini Andesh
- 65) Dinesh Udhvani
- 66) Anil Dhooria
- 67) Ashok Sankhala
- 68) S. Vaishnav
- 69) Om Prakash Meghwal
- 70) Kishan Acharya
- 71) Madho Sharma
- 72) S. P. S. Arora
- 73) Suneesh M. K.
- 74) Mustafa T. P.
- 75) C. Kirubakaran
- 76) D. Ravi
- 77) Anabalagan
- 78) Palanimariappan
- 79) Chandran
- 80) Shailendra Singh Bhadoriya

2. If not, what relief the above mentioned Sales Promotion Employees are entitled to?"

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 13th June, 2014.

—
Order

28/16/2014-Lab/325

Whereas the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. GKB Hi-Tech Lenses Pvt. Ltd., 50, Tivim Industrial Estate, Karaswada, Mapusa-Goa and its workman, Shri Abhijeet Desai, represented by the Goa Trade and Commercial Workers' Union, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said dispute");

And whereas the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under Section 7-A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- "(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s. GKB Hi-Tech Lenses Pvt. Ltd., Karaswada, Mapusa-Goa in refusing employment to Shri Abhijeet Desai, Operator with effect from 07-09-2012, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 05th June, 2014.

—
Notification

No. 28/1/2014-Lab/155

The following award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 18-12-2013 in reference

No. IT/78/2002 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 24th February, 2014.

**IN THE LABOUR COURT-II
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI**

**(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar, Hon'ble
Presiding Officer)**

Ref. No. IT/78/2002

Shri Mario C. Vaz,
rep. by Shri K.V. Nadkarny,
M-2S, Housing Board Colony,
Gogal, Margao-Goa Workman/Party I
v/s

M/s. Swan Distilleries P. Ltd.,
2nd Floor, Fondekar Bldg.,
Malbhat, Margao-Goa Employer/Party II
Workman/Party I represented by Shri K. V. Nadkarny.

Employer/Party II represented by Adv. Shri M. S. Bandodkar.

Panaji, dated 18-12-2013.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10 (1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa, by Order dated 22-11-2002 bearing No. 28/58/2002-LAB, referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa. The Hon'ble Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court in turn assigned the present dispute for its adjudication to this Labour Court-II, Panaji-Goa vide her order dated 02-09-2010.

"(1) Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Swan Distilleries Pvt. Ltd., Margao, in terminating the services of Shri C. Mario Vaz, Driver, with effect from 19-12-2001, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. IT/78/2002 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the Parties put in their appearance. The Party-I (for short 'Workman'), filed his Statement of Claim on 16-01-2003 at Exb. 4. The facts of the case in brief as pleaded by the Workman are that he was employed with the Employer/Party II (for short 'Employer') as a 'driver' on their pick-up van used for the sale of their liquor product as well as to carry their raw material etc. He stated that he was subjected to exploitation by compelling to work for almost 12 hours per day as well as on Sundays, without any extra monetary benefit or even compensatory day of rest in lieu of holiday. He stated that he was later on given a day of rest once in two weeks. He stated that his attendance was being marked by the authorized person of the Employer at the residence of the Employer. He stated that he was parking the vehicle and also delivering the vehicle for sales delivery from the residence of the Employer of the company. He stated that initially his salary was paid regularly, but subsequently his monthly earned wages were also delayed. He stated that he was paid his salary in part. He stated that he was paid Rs. 300/- and sometimes Rs. 500/- as advance every week. He stated that he was asked to write the daily mileage covered and each place visited by the salesman on a notebook provided to him. He stated that initially he was also directed to record the amount of fuel consumed for the sales work and the cost of fuel. He stated that subsequently he was instructed to stop writing the cost of fuel etc. He submitted that he was regularly requesting the Employer to settle his unpaid salary and also to pay him overtime wages for the overtime work done by him. He stated that he was asked to submit the statement of amount towards the overtime dues and unpaid salaries to him by the Employer. He stated that he had prepared the same manually and also submitted to the Employer Shri P. L. G. Manu in the morning of 18-12-2001 while taking the delivery of the vehicle for sales duty. He stated that on the same night when he delivered the vehicle at the residence of the Employer, he was informed by Mr. P. L. G. Manu that his services are not required from the next date and that he should come to office and collect his wages up to 18-12-2001. He stated that he had approached the office of the Employer as directed and demanded for full settlement of his salaries and overtime dues, but he was physically driven away by snatching the keys of the vehicle by telling 'do what you can'. He submitted that on the

date of his oral termination of services he had completed over two years of service. He submitted that at the time of termination of his services, he was neither paid any amount in lieu of notice nor paid any retrenchment compensation as required u/s 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947. He therefore submitted that the termination of his services is illegal and bad-in-law. The Workman therefore prayed that the action of the Employer in orally terminating his services with effect from 19-12-2001 be held as illegal and bad-in-law and the Employer be directed to reinstate him back in the services with effect from 19-12-2001 with full back wages and continuity in service.

3. The Employer controverted to the aforesaid claim statement of the Workman by filing their written statement on 26-03-2003 at Exb.6. The Employer, by way of preliminary objections submitted that the entire reference is not maintainable and bad-in-law as the Government of Goa has failed to apply its mind while making the reference to the pre-dominant question to find out whether the workman concerned was their employee or not. The employer submitted that no employer-employee relationship existed between them and the workman and therefore any dispute raised against them by a non-employee or non-workman cannot form part of the industrial dispute u/s 2-A or any other provision of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Employer submitted that right from the beginning, when the dispute was raised by the concerned Workman, it has been the case of the Employer that they did not employ the Workman and therefore the purported dispute cannot form a part of the industrial dispute. The Employer further submitted that the documents purported to have been produced in the conciliation proceedings or list produced before the Hon'ble Court by the Workman does not show that there exist any employer-employee relationship between themselves and Mr. C. Mario Vaz.

4. The Employer denied that the workman was employed by them as a vehicle driver on the pick-up van which was used for sale of their liquor products or to carry their raw materials etc. The Employer stated that since they have not employed the workman at any point of time, the question of terminating his services with effect from 19-12-2001 or any other date does not arise. The Employer submitted that consequently no relief of whatsoever nature can be granted against them. The Employer submitted that in view of the aforesaid reasons, the question of re-employment of the workman or his demand for full back wages and/or continuity in service

and other consequential benefits, does not arise. The Employer denied the overall case of the Workman and prayed for dismissal of the present reference issued by the Government of Goa.

5. Thereafter the Workman filed his re-joinder on 05-05-2003 at Exb.7. The Workman, by way of his rejoinder, confirms and reiterates all the submissions and averments made by him in his Statement of Claim filed in the present proceedings to be true and correct and denies all the statements and averments made by the Employer in their written statement filed in the present proceedings which are contrary and inconsistent to the statements and averments made by him.

6. Based on the pleadings filed by the respective parties, this court framed the following issues on 07-07-2003 at Exb.8.

1. Whether the Party I proves that he was employed with the Party II as a driver?
2. Whether the Party I proves that the Party II terminated his services with effect from 19-12-2001 in contravention of the provisions of Sec.25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947?
3. Whether the Party I proves that the action of the Party II in terminating his services w.e.f. 19-12-2001 is illegal and unjustified?
4. Whether the Party II proves that the reference is not maintainable for the reasons stated in para A to D of the written statement?
5. Whether the Party I is entitled to any relief?
6. What Award?

7. My answers to the aforesaid issues are as under:

Issue No. 1	: In the negative.
Issue No. 2	: In the negative.
Issue No. 3	: In the negative.
Issue No. 4	: In the affirmative.
Issue Nos. 5 & 6	: As per the final order.

REASONS

8. *Issue Nos. 1 and 4*: I am deciding the issue Nos. 1 and 4 together as both the said issues are co-related to each other.

I have heard the oral arguments of the Ld. Rep. Shri K. V. Nadkarny appearing for the Workman as well as Ld. Adv. Shri M. S. Bandodkar appearing for the Employer Company.

9. Ld. Rep. Shri K. V. Nadkarny, representing the Workman, during the course of his oral arguments submitted that in order to prove his case, the Workman has produced on record certain oral as well as documentary evidence by examining himself. He submitted that the Workman in his oral evidence on record clearly deposed that he was employed with the Employer company as a driver with effect from 15-09-1999, but he was not issued any letter of appointment by the Employer Company and that his salary was fixed at Rs. 2000/- per month inclusive of all the allowances. He submitted that the Workman has also produced on record copies of attendance note book for the period from 15-09-1999 to 18-12-2001 (Exb. W-1), a copy of the note book for the period from 29-05-2001 to 18-12-2001 containing the entries of consumption of diesel and mileage (Exb. W-2), a copy of requisition slip dated 18-12-2001 (Exb. W-3), a copy of the note book for the period from 10-08-2001 to 18-12-2001 regarding the movement of the vehicle (Exb. W-4), copies of the certificates dated 24-10-1999, 21-11-1999 and 19-12-1999 issued by the Health Officer, Primary Health Centre, Curtorim-Goa (Exb. W-5-colly), a copy of delivery note dated 13-03-2000 (Exb. W-6) and copies of credit bill dated 12-09-2001, 31-10-2001 and 08-12-2001 (Exb. W-7-colly). He finally submitted that the aforesaid oral as well as documentary evidence adduced by the Workman on record clearly proves that the workman was employed with the Employer as a driver since 15-09-1999 on a salary of Rs. 2000/- p.m. He submitted that consequently there existed an employer-employee relationship between the parties.

10. On the contrary, Ld. Adv. Shri M. S. Bandodkar representing the Employer Company, during the course of his oral arguments submitted that the burden to prove the issue No. 1 that he was employed by the Employer Company is on the Workman. He submitted that the Workman shall prove his case by cogent and reliable evidence; however he failed to do so. In support of his oral contention, he relied upon two judgments of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi one in the case of **Ravi N. Tikoo v/s Dy. Commissioner (S.W.) and Ors., of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi reported in 2006 LLR 496** and another in the case of **Automobile Association of Upper India v/s P. O. Labour Court II and Anr., of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi**

reported in 2006 LLR 851. He submitted that the Workman was not employed by the Employer at any point of time as can be seen from the evidence adduced by the Workman. He submitted that it appears from the pleadings of the workman as well as evidence adduced by him that he was an employee of one Mr. P. L. G. Manu and not the Employer Company. He submitted that the said Mr. P. L. G. Manu was marking his attendance on a note book at his residence or sometimes his wife Mrs. Rachana Manu and not by the Employer Company. He submitted that he was driving the pickup bearing No. GA-02-U-5108. He submitted that the said motor vehicle belongs to Mr. P. L. G. Manu and not belongs to the Employer Company. He submitted that the Workman, in his cross-examination admitted that he used to visit the house of Shri P. L. G. Manu for parking the vehicle and also for collecting the key. He submitted that the Workman has also admitted that the key of the vehicle was handed over to either the servant or the son or wife of the said Mr. Manu. On the contrary the oral as well as documentary evidence adduced by the Employer Company on record such as attendance register/muster roll, wage register, ESI returns, P.F. returns, copy of certificate of registration, copy of settlement dated 19-7-2005 of the relevant period does not show the name of the Workman. He submitted that the documents produced by the workman on record do not indicate that the Workman was employed with the Employer Company. In support of his oral contentions, he relied upon the following judgments of various High Courts.

- a) In the case of H. N. Rajappan, s/o Narayanan v/s The Presiding Officer, Labour Office, Kannur and Ors., of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, reported in 2013 LLR 993.
- b) In the case of Mahindra and Mahindra v/s The Presiding Officer and Anr., of Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana, reported in 2012 (4) LLN 506.
- c) In the case of Prem v/s Chirag Boutique of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, reported in 2008 (5) LLN 245.
- d) In the case of Ravindra Baburao Ambolkar v/s Gujrat Tea Canteen and Anr., of Hon'ble High Court of Bombay, reported in 1996 LLR 40.
- e) In the case of Rampat v/s Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Panipat and Anr., of Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana, reported in 2013 LLR 323.

I have carefully perused the entire records of the present case. I have also carefully considered the oral submissions made by the representatives appearing for the respective parties.

11. In the case of **Ravi N. Tikoo v/s Dy. Commissioner (S.W.) and Ors., reported in 2006 LLR 496**, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has held that *"it is well settled principle that onus and burden of proving or establishing the employment is consequently on the workman and he has to discharge the same by leading cogent and reliable evidence which could be either oral or documentary whereas in the present case there has been no such evidence and as such proceedings before the adjudicators liable to be quashed"*.

12. In the case of **Automobile Association of Upper India v/s P.O. Labour Court II and Anr., reported in 2006 LLR 851**, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has observed that *"it is well settled that the primary burden of proof to establish a plea rests on a person so claiming"*.

The principle laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in its aforesaid two judgments is well recognized and equally applicable in the case in hand. In the case in hand, the Workman has raised the present dispute against the Employer pertaining to his alleged illegal termination of service w. e. f. 19-12-2001 by alleging that he was employed with the Employer company as a driver on a salary of Rs. 2000/- p.m. The Employer denied that they have employed the workman at any point of time. The burden to prove the aforesaid contention is therefore on the Workman.

13. The Workman filed his Statement of Claim, setting forth his ground of challenge of termination of his services. The workman, in his initial paragraph of the claim statement pleaded that he was employed in the services of the Company as a vehicle driver. The workman however, in subsequent paragraph of his claim statement pleaded that he had manually prepared a statement of account towards overtime dues and unpaid salary and submitted to the Employer Shri P. L. G. Manu. The aforesaid pleadings on the part of the Workman do not make clear as to who was his Employer i.e. M/s. Swan Distilleries Pvt. Ltd., Margao or Mr. P. L. G. Manu. The records of the case indicate that M/s. Swan Distilleries Pvt. Ltd., Margao-Goa is not a proprietary concern of Mr. P. L. G. Manu, but it is a private limited company represented by its directors. M/s. Swan Distilleries Pvt. Ltd., Margao-Goa and Mr. P. L. G. Manu are two different persons/

/legal entities. Thus the claim statement filed by the workman in the present proceedings does not make clear as to who was his employer.

14. The Workman, in order to prove his case, produced on record certain oral as well as documentary evidence by examining himself. The Workman has produced on record a copy of note book for the period from 15-09-1999 to 18-12-2001 (Exb. W-1) in support of his oral evidence that his daily attendance were marked in the said note book. The Workman has also identified the signatures appearing in the said note book at Exb.W-1 to be of father-in-law of the proprietor Shri P. L. G. Manu, his servant Mr. Mohanand, his wife Mrs. Rachana Manu and his son Mrinal. The Workman further deposed that there are no signatures on the note book at Exb. W-1 as the proprietor of the Employer or his wife or his son stopped signing the note book. The Workman has produced on record a copy of the note book (Exb. W-2) in support of his oral evidence that he was recording the diesel consumption and the kilometer run by the vehicle bearing No. GA-02-U-5108. The Workman has produced on record a copy of the requisition slip dated 18-12-2001 (Exb. W-3) in support of his oral evidence that he was given diesel requisition slip by the Employer Company to fill diesel in the vehicle. The Workman has produced on record a copy of the note book for the period from 10-08-2001 to 18-12-2001 (Exb. W-4) in support of his oral evidence that he was maintaining the note book for recording the entries towards the movement of the vehicle. The Workman has also produced on record a copy of delivery note dated 13-03-2000 (Exb. W-6) in support of his oral evidence that the Employer Company had sent him for building body on the chassis of Mahindra Pickup to Aerocoach Automotive Body Builders, Ponda-Goa. The Workman has finally produced on record three copies of credit bills dated 12-09-2001, 31-10-2001 and 08-12-2001 respectively (Exb. W-7-colly) in support of his oral evidence that the Employer Company also used to send him for repairs and servicing of their vehicle to DPC Motors Pvt. Ltd., Margao, Salcete-Goa an authorized dealer of M/s. Mahindra and Mahindra having their workshop at Fatorda, Margao-Goa.

15. The Workman, in his cross-examination admitted that the keys of the vehicle were handed over to him either by the servant or the son or wife of Mr. P. L. G. Manu. He deposed that early in the morning he was visiting the house of Mr. P. L.G. Manu to collect the key of the vehicle. He deposed

that there were lot of staff employed with the Employer and they were being paid the salary on the register and their attendance was being marked on the register. He deposed that his signature was not being taken on any wage register. He deposed that he is not aware if the employees of the Employer were signing the attendance register. He deposed that he was not covered under the E. S. I. and Provident Fund Act. There are no signatures on the note book at Exb. W-4. The Workman also admitted that all the credit bills at Exb. W-7-colly are in the name of Mr. P. L. G. Manu.

16. On careful perusal of the oral as well as documentary evidence adduced by the Workman on record, it reveals that he was driving a m/vehicle bearing No. GA-02-U-5108 in discharge of his duties. The Employer Company has produced on record a copy of registration certificate book of the said Mahindra pickup bearing No. GA-02-U-5108 (Exb. 25). The said R.C. book at Exb. 25 clearly shows that Mr. P. L.G. Manu is the registered owner of the said vehicle bearing No. GA-02-U-5108. The Workman has also failed to establish any link between the Employer Company and the said vehicle bearing No. GA-02-U-5108. The evidence on record indicates that the attendance of the workman was being marked by the family members of Mr. P. L.G. Manu. The evidence on record further indicates that the workman used to park the vehicle and also collecting the keys for delivering the vehicle for sales duty from the house of the said P. L. G. Manu. The evidence on record further indicates that the signatures of the workman were not being taken on any wage register and that he was not covered under the ESI and P. F. Act.

17. The Workman has also produced on record the copies of three certificates dated 24-10-1999, 21-11-1999 and 19-12-1999 issued by the Health Officer, Primary Health Centre, Curtorim-Goa (Exb. W-5-colly) in support of his oral evidence that the Employer Company used to depute him for work at PHC, Curtorim alongwith their vehicle in connection with the Pulse Polio Immunization programme. On careful perusal of the said certificates issued by the Health Officer, Primary Health Centre, Curtorim-Goa, it is observed that the Health Officer, Primary Health Centre, Curtorim-Goa certified that the Workman had attended the Pulse Polio Immunization Programme alongwith vehicle No. GA-01-C-7064 on 24-10-1999 and also on 21-11-1999 and 19-12-1999 along with vehicle No. GA-02/J-2711 of the Employer Company. The Workman has however failed to examine Dr. Sawant

who had issued him certificates at Exb. W-5-colly nor disclosed the basis or source of information by which the said Dr. Sawant being third party, has certified him as an employee of the Employer Company, hence no weightage can be given to the said certificates.

18. On the contrary, the Employer Company examined one Shri Suji Kumar Mathew, one of its directors. The oral evidence of the said Employer's witness, Shri Suji Kumar Mathew indicates that they have not employed the Workman at any point of time. He produced on record attendance register/ muster roll of the relevant period (Exb. 21-colly), wage register of the relevant period (Exb. 22-colly), copies of ESI returns (Exb. 23-colly), copies of PF returns (Exb. 24-colly), copy of settlement dated 19-7-2005 (Exb. 26-colly), its letter dated 22-01-2002 (Exb. 28-colly) and a copy of award dated 12-12-2007 passed by Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court at Panaji in its case No. IT/23/2004 (Exb.36). On careful perusal of the aforesaid documentary evidence adduced by the Employer on record, the name of the Workman is not appearing in any of the aforesaid documents.

19. In the case of **H. N. Rajappan, s/o Narayanan v/s The Presiding Officer, Labour Office, Kannur and Ors. reported in 2013 LLR 993**, the Hon'ble High Court of Kerela has held that *"in order to determine an employee to be a workman under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, it is immaterial whether he is a temporary, permanent or probationer. It is imperative that he should be in the employment of the employer."*

20. In the case of **Mahindra and Mahindra v/s The Presiding Officer and Anr., reported in 2012 (4) LLN 506**, before the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana, the burden was casted on the Respondent No. 2-Workman to prove the issue of employer-employee between the Respondent No. 2 and the Petitioner. The Hon'ble High Court has observed that *"the workman has not produced any material on record to discharge the burden that he was the employee of the Petitioner. He did not produce any appointment letter. No evidence was led to prove that he was ever paid any amount by the Petitioner. It is not the case of Respondent No. 2 that though he did not have any record of the same but the same be summoned from the Petitioner, which may prove payment of salary to him. Under those circumstances, on failure of the Petitioner to produce the record, an adverse inference could be drawn."*

21. In the case of **Prem v/s Chirag Boutique, reported in 2008 (5) LLN 245**, before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, the Petitioner has assailed a no relief award passed by the Labour Court against him stating inter alia that he failed to establish the relationship of an employee and an employer between the petitioner workman and the respondent-management. The Hon'ble High Court while dismissing the writ petition observed that *"a perusal of the impugned award shows that the aforesaid document was duly taken into consideration by the Labour Court while passing the impugned award. The aforesaid document has been reproduced in para 9 of the award. It is rightly observed by the court below that a perusal of the said document does not show that the Petitioner-Workman was employed by the Respondent-Management or that there existed a relationship of an employer-employee between them. Apart from the aforesaid document, there is no other document produced or sought to be produced by the Petitioner before the court below."*

22. In the case of **Ravindra Baburao Ambolkar v/s Gujrat Tea Canteen and Anr., reported in 1996 LLR 40**, the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay the Petitioner has challenged the award of the 11th Labour Court, Bombay in writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay. The Hon'ble High Court while dismissing the writ petition filed by the Petitioner has held that *"in an industrial dispute the contractual relationship between the Employer and the Petitioner there was no evidence except unsupported bare word of Petitioner that he was in employment. No co-worker could be produced to affirm it. The Labour Court has rightly chosen to disbelieve the evidence of the petitioner completely."*

23. In the case of **Rampat v/s Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Panipat and Anr., reported in 2013 LLR 323**, the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana while dismissing the writ petition filed by the Petitioner observed that *"the Petitioner failed to establish that he was employee in the school of the Respondent. No proof of salary or wages having been paid to the Petitioner was produced on the record. Neither appointment nor termination order was there. Only the identity card issued by the board of school education, Haryana is not sufficient evidence to prove employment, the Labour Court rightly dismissed the claim of the Petitioner."*

24. In the case of **Automobile Association of Upper India v/s P.O. Labour Court II and Anr., reported in 2006 LLR 851**, the Hon'ble High Court

of Delhi has observed that “*engagement and appointment in service can be established directly by the existence and production of an appointment letter, a written agreement or by circumstantial evidence of incidental and ancillary records which would be in the nature of attendance register, salary registers, leave records, deposit of provident fund contribution and employees state insurance contributions etc. The same can be produced and proved by the workman or he call upon and caused the same to be produced and proved by calling for witnesses who are required to produce and prove these records. The workman can even make an appropriate application calling upon the management to call such records in respect of his employment to be produced. In these circumstances, if the management then fails to produce such records, an adverse inference is liable to be drawn against the management and in favour of the workman.*”

Among the aforesaid judgments of Hon'ble High Courts relied upon by Ld. Adv. Shri M. S. Bhandarkar appearing for the Employer, the judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the case of Prem v/s. Chirag Boutique is exactly on the same point.

25. Applying the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in its case of Prem v/s Chirag Boutique, in the case in hand, the evidence on record indicates that the attendance of the workman was being marked by the family members of Mr. P. L. G. Manu in a separate note book at Exb.W-1. The evidence on record further indicates that the workman used to park the vehicle and also collecting the keys for delivering the vehicle for sales duty from the house of the said P. L. G. Manu. The evidence on record further indicates that Workman was being paid his wages by Mr. P. L. G. Manu. The evidence on record indicate, that the Workman was not covered under the ESI and P.F. Act. All the aforesaid evidence on record clearly established that the Workman was working for Mr. P. L. G. Manu and not for the Employer Company, which is a separate legal entity.

26. Thus, the oral as well as documentary evidence adduced by both the parties on record clearly established that the Workman was not employed by the Employer Company at any point of time and as such there existed no employer-employee relationship between the Employer Company and the Workman. Hence it is held that the Workman has failed to prove that he was employed with the Employer Company as driver since 15-09-1999 on a salary of Rs. 2000/- per month.

It is further held that the Employer Company proved that there existed no employer-employee relationship between the Employer Company and the Workman and therefore the Party-I is not a Workman u/s. 2 (s) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The issue No.1 is therefore answered in the negative and the issue No. 4 is answered in the affirmative.

27. Issue Nos. 2, 3 and 5: While deciding the issue No. 1 hereinabove, I have come to the conclusion and held that the Workman failed to prove that he was employed with the Employer as a driver at any point of time. Similarly while deciding the issue No. 4 herein above I have come to the conclusion and held that there existed no employer-employee relationship between the Employer Company and the Workman and as such the Party I is not a Workman as defined u/s 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

28. Thus, the Workman failed to prove that he was employed with the Employer Company as a driver at any point of time. The question of terminating his services by the Employer with effect from 19-12-2001 in contravention of the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 and/or legality and justifiability of termination of his services, therefore does not arise. The Party I is not entitled to any relief. The issue Nos. 2 and 3 are answered accordingly. The issue No. 5 is answered in the negative.

In view of above facts and circumstances of the case, I proceed to pass the following order:

ORDER

It is held that Shri C. Mario Vaz is not a 'Workman' as defined u/s 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The reference as to whether the action of the Management of M/s. Swan Distilleries Pvt. Ltd., Margao, in terminating the services of Shri C. Mario Vaz, Driver, with effect from 19-12-2001, is legal and justified, therefore does not survive.

2. It is further held that the Party I Shri C. Mario Vaz, is not entitled to any relief.
3. No order as to costs.
4. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-
(Suresh N. Narulkar)
Presiding Officer
Labour Court

Department of Law & Judiciary

Law (Establishment) Division

—
Order

File No. 5/40/2000-LD(Estt)/1346

Whereas the Government vide Notification No. 5/40/2000-LD(Estt.) dated 24-10-2000, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 32 dated 09-11-2000, appointed Advocate Mrs. Winnie Coutinho (hereinafter called as the "Applicant") as a Notary for a period of five years in the Judicial Division of Tiswadi Taluka with effect from 24-10-2000;

And whereas the Government vide Certificate of Practice dated 24-10-2000 has certified that the Applicant is authorized to practice as a Notary for a period of 5 years from 24-10-2000 in and throughout Tiswadi Taluka;

And whereas the period of validity of the Certificate of Practice dated 24-10-2000 issued to the Applicant expired on 23-10-2005;

And whereas the Applicant did not get her Certificate of Practice renewed even after the expiry of the period of validity of the said Certificate of Practice on 23-10-2005 as required by sub-section (2) of Section 5 of the Notaries Act, 1952 (Central Act 53 of 1952) (hereinafter called as the "said Act");

And whereas the Applicant has failed to get her Certificate of Practice renewed;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of clause (f) of Section 10 of the said Act, the Government of Goa hereby removes from the Register maintained by it under Section 4 of the said Act, the name of the Applicant entered as a Notary.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vasanti H. Parvatkar, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 1st July, 2014.

Notification

No. 14-3-2008-LD-Estt. (CBI)/1342

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Central Act 49 of 1988) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), the Government of Goa hereby appoints Shri P. V. Sawaikar, District Judge-I and

Additional Sessions Judge, Panaji, as Special Judge for the whole of the State of Goa, for exclusive trial of corruption cases investigated by the Central Bureau of Investigation or Anti-Corruption Branch at Panaji, and/or all agencies of the Government of Goa such as the Criminal Investigation Department, Special Investigation Team or any other branch of the Police under the said Act.

This issues in supersession of the Government Notification No. 14-3-2008-LD-Estt. (CBI)/985 dated 02-05-2014, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 6 dated 08-05-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vasanti H. Parvatkar, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 1st July, 2014.

Notification by the High Court of
Judicature

Appellate Side, Bombay

Resolution No. A-3902/G/2014/1877

Read: 1) Letter No. DSC/Valpoi-100/2014/4417 dated 28th May, 2014 received from the Principal District & Sessions Judge, North Goa, Panaji.

RESOLUTION: The Honourable High Court is pleased to permit Ms. Shubhada A. Dalvi, Civil Judge, Junior Division and Judicial Magistrate First Class, Satari at Valpoi, to sit twice a week at Satari at Valpoi i.e. Monday & Wednesday and for remaining days of the week at "B" Court, Bicholim, on deputation.

High Court, Bombay
Dated: 23rd June, 2014.

Dr. Mrs. *Shalini S. Phansalkar-Joshi*
Registrar General

Department of Personnel

—
Order

File No. 12/1/2013-PER(A)/4073

Smt. Ezilda J. Dias e Araujo, Office Superintendent (outside Secretariat) Directorate of Health Services, Panaji is hereby transferred and posted to the Directorate of Mines & Geology, Panaji in public interest.

Smt. Ezilda J. Dias e Araujo, O.S. should report to the Directorate of Mines, Panaji by 01-07-2014 and compliance report be sent to this Department.

R. Aga, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim, 30th June, 2014.

Order

File No. 13/09/2014-PER/4081

Government of Goa is pleased to grant extension in service to Dr. Sachin Y. Govekar, Dy. Director, National Vector Borne Disease Control Programme, DHS, Panaji beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-07-2014 to 31-12-2014.

The extension is subject to termination without assigning any reason at any time during the period of extension.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

R. Aga, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim, 30th June, 2014.

Order

File No. 13/08/2014-PER/4070

Government of Goa is pleased to grant extension in service to Dr. Ganapati Kakodkar, Health Officer, Community Health Centre, Curchorem beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-07-2014 to 31-12-2014.

The extension is subject to termination without assigning any reason at any time during the period of extension.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

R. Aga, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim, 30th June, 2014.

Order

File No. 4/12/85-PER Vol. I/4082

Consequent upon retirement of Shri P. Tufani, Director of Agriculture, Panaji w.e.f. 30-06-2014 (a.n.), Shri Orlando Rodrigues, Dy. Director of Agriculture, holding the post of Managing Director, Goa State Horticulture Corporation Ltd., Tonca, Goa is hereby appointed to the post of Director of Agriculture, on officiating basis with

immediate effect and until further orders or till the post is filled on regular basis whichever is earlier.

Consequently, Mr. Nelson Figeredo, General Manager, Goa State Horticulture Corporation, Tonca Goa shall hold the charge as Managing Director, Goa Horticulture Development Corporation Tonca, Panaji in addition to his own duties.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

R. Aga, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim, 30th June, 2014.

◆◆◆
Department of Revenue

—
Order

No. 22/29/2013-RD

Whereas, the Government of Goa, vide Notification No. 22/29/2013-RD dated 15-10-2013, issued under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), and published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 30 dated 24-10-2013, notified that the land specified in the Schedule there of (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. Land Acquisition for the construction of Coastal Security Station at Talpona Village Poinguinim of Canacona Taluka (hereinafter referred to as the "said public purpose");

And whereas, the Government of Goa, considered the report made by the Collector under sub-section (2) of Section 5-A of the said Act and on being satisfied that the said land is needed for the said public purpose, vide Notification No. 22/29/2013-RD dated 19-02-2014, issued under Section 6 of the said Act, and published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 47 dated 20-02-2014, declared that the said land is required for the said public purpose.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Act 1 of 1894), the Government of Goa hereby directs the Collector, South Goa District, Margao-Goa to take the order for acquisition of the said land.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Ashutosh Apte, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 26th June, 2014.

Notification

No. 22/31/2013-RD

Whereas, by Government Notification No. 22/31/2013-RD dated 28-11-2013 published on page 865 of Series II No. 36 of the Official Gazette dated 05-12-2013 and in two newspapers (1) "Lokmat" and (2) "Gomantak Times" both dated 30-11-2013, it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act"), that the land specified in the Schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the said land), was needed for public purpose, viz. Land Acquisition for segregation of dry waste at Colva in Survey No. 11/6 & 8 of Salcete Taluka.

And whereas, the Government of Goa (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") after considering the report made under sub-section (2) of Section 5-A the said Act is satisfied that the land specified in the Schedule hereto is needed for the public purpose specified above (hereinafter referred to as "the said land").

Now, therefore, the Government hereby declares under the provisions of Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government also hereby appoints under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Dy. Collector (L.A.), Collectorate of South Goa, Margao to perform the functions of the Collector for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land and directs him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the Dy. Collector (L.A.), Collectorate of South Goa, Margao, till the award is made under Section 11.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka: Salcete Village: Colva

Survey No./ Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approx. area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
11/6 (part)	O: Raghunath Shet Alve.	191
11/8	O: Josina Fernandes.	1175

1

2

3

Boundaries:

North : Road, S. No. 11/1.

South : S. No. 12/1 & 13/5, 8, 9.

East : S. No. 11/5, 6, S. No. 10/3.

West : S. No. 11/1.

Total: 1966

By order and in the name of the Governor
of Goa.

Ashutosh Apte, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 25th June, 2014.

**Department of Town & Country Planning**

Office of the Chief Town Planner

Notification

No. 4-5-2-84-UDD(Part)TCP/2012/14/2733

Read: Notification No. 4-5-2-84-UDD(Part)TCP/2012/14/2220 dated 28-05-2014.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to sub-rule (1) of Rule 3 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Town & Country Planning (Planning and Development Authorities) Rules, 1977, the Government of Goa hereby further extends the term of office of the Chairman and members of the North Goa Planning and Development Authority constituted vide Notification No. 4-5-2-84-UDD (PART) TCP/2012/1354 dated 24-4-12, published in Official Gazette, Series II No. 5 dated 03-05-2012 upto 31-08-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor
of Goa.

S. T. Puttaraju, Chief Town Planner & ex officio
Joint Secretary.

Panaji, 30th June, 2014.

Notification

No. 4-5-2-84-UDD(Part)TCP/2012/14/2734

Read: Notification No. 4-5-2-84-UDD(Part)TCP/2012/14/2221 dated 28-05-2014.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to sub-rule (1) of Rule 3 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Town & Country Planning (Planning and Development Authorities) Rules, 1977, the Government of Goa hereby further extends the term of office of the Chairman and members of the South Goa Planning and Development

Authority constituted vide Notification No. 4-5-2-84-UDD (PART) TCP/2012/1353 dated 24-4-12. published in Official Gazette, Series II No. 5 dated 03-05-2012 upto 31-08-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

S. T. Puttaraju, Chief Town Planner & ex officio Joint Secretary.

Panaji, 30th June, 2014.

Notification

No. 4-5-2-84-UDD(Pt)TCP/12/14/2735

Read: Notification No. 4-5-2-84-UDD(Pt)TCP/12/14/2314 dated 03-06-2014.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to sub-rule (1) of Rule 3 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Town & Country Planning (Planning and Development Authorities) Rules, 1977, the Government of Goa hereby further extends the term of office of the Chairman and members of the Mormugao Planning and Development Authority constituted vide Notification No. 4-5-2-84-UDD (Pt)/12/1796 dated 01-06-2012 published in Official Gazette, Series II No. 10 dated 07-06-2012 upto 31-08-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

S. T. Puttaraju, Chief Town Planner & ex officio Joint Secretary.

Panaji, 30th June, 2014.

Department of Urban Development

Corporation of the City of Panaji

Notification

Ref. 13/22/TAX/CCP/2006-07/2014-2015/1601

As per the Circular dated 31-10-2013 issued by the Department of Urban Development (Municipal Administration) on National Policy on Urban Street Vendor 2009 and order dated 09-09-2013 of the

Hon'ble Supreme Court on the above mentioned subject matter, Corporation of the City of Panaji hereby constitutes Town Vending Committee (T.V.C.) to perform the functions assigned to it under the National Policy on Urban Street Vendor 2009 consisting of following persons:-

- | Chairman | Commissioner, C. C. P. |
|--|--|
| 1. Representative of Local Authority, Planning Authority, Police | (i) Shri Krishna Ramdas Shirodkar-Corporator.
(ii) Miss Maya Ramkrishna Talkar-Corporator.
(iii) Member Secretary of N. G. P. D. A.
(iv) Police Inspector, Panaji Traffic Cell. |
| 2. Members from Association of Street Vendors | (v) Chairman, Gada Owner's Association.
(vi) Smt. Sunanda Govekar, Vendor.
(vii) Smt. Merlin Albuquerque, Vendor. |
| 3. Members of Resident Welfare Association & Community Based Organisation (C.B.O.) | (viii) Shri Yatin Parekh, Chairman of Padmavati Towers, Premises Maintenance Society, 18th June Road, Panaji. |
| 4. Members of Civil Society Organisation (N.G.O.) Rep. of Professional Groups (Lawyers, Doctors, Town Planners, Architects etc.), Trade & Commerce, Rep. of Scheduled Banks & Eminent Citizens | (ix) Representative of G.C.C.I.
(x) Shri Arminio Rebeiro, Architect, Fontainhas, Panaji. |

Sanjit Rodrigues, Commissioner.

Panaji, 8th July, 2014.

V. No. A-8691/2014.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,
Government Printing Press,
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE—Rs. 14.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA-117/350-7/2014.